

KING COUNTY METROPOLITAN SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

July 13, 2007

11:45 – 2:30 p.m.

King Street Center, 8th Floor Conference Center

Approved Minutes

Members in Attendance

<u>Name</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Title</u>
Bill Peloza	City of Auburn	Councilmember
Sharon Hlavka	City of Auburn	Solid Waste Supervisor
Joyce Nichols	City of Bellevue	Utilities Policy Advisor
Debbie Anspaugh	City of Bothell	Administrative Coordinator
Joan McGilton	City of Burien	Mayor
David Baker	City of Kenmore	Deputy Mayor
Jessica Greenway	City of Kirkland	Councilmember
Erin Leonhart	City of Kirkland	Public Works Maintenance Supervisor
Jean Garber	City of Newcastle	Mayor
Linda Knight	City of Renton	Solid Waste Coordinator
Rika Cecil	City of Shoreline	Environmental Programs Coordinator
Frank Iriarte	City of Tukwila	Deputy Public Works Director

Others in Attendance

Solid Waste Division

Gemma Alexander, SWD Staff

Jennifer Broadus, SWD Staff

Jeff Gaisford, Recycling and Environmental Services Section Manager

Jane Gateley, SWD Staff

Tom Karston, Finance and Rate Analyst

Kevin Kiernan, Interim Division Director

Sandra Matteson, SWD Staff

Josh Marx, SWD Staff

Bob Tocarciuc, Planning Supervisor

Thea Severn, Transfer and Transport Section Manager

Diane Yates, Intergovernmental Relations Liaison

King County Council Staff

Mike Reed

Michael Huddleston

Guests

Charles Banks, R.L. Banks & Associates

Jeff Clunie, R.W. Beck Consultants

Harvey Gershman, Gershman, Brickner & Bratton, Inc.

Kyle Heitkamp, Geomatrix Consultants

Karl Hufnagel, R.W. Beck Consultants

Sabrina Kang, Suburban Cities Association

Damon M. K. Taam, Power Waste Recovery

Rory Tipton, R.W. Beck Consultants

1 **Call to Order**

2 MSWMAC Chair Jean Garber called the meeting to order at 12:10. Everyone present
3 introduced themselves.

4
5 Garber announced that Solid Waste Division staff, Gemma Alexander, will be leaving
6 MSWMAC to go to China to pick up her daughter. Division staff Jennifer Broadus will
7 take the meeting minutes in the future.

8
9 Garber also congratulated Kevin Kiernan on his appointment as the Interim Director of
10 the Solid Waste Division. Former Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)
11 Director Pam Bissonnette has retired and Theresa Jennings is now the Interim Director of
12 DNRP.

13
14 **Approve June Meeting Minutes and Review Agenda**

15 **MSWMAC member Joan McGilton moved to approve the June minutes.**

16
17 MSWMAC member Bill Peloza asked that at page six, line 155 the second “that” be
18 removed, and on line 180 a period should follow the word “haulers.” Peloza also
19 commented that MSWMAC member Carolyn Armanini’s use of the word “seduced” on
20 line 183 was an interesting choice of words.

21
22 MSWMAC member Erin Leonhart clarified her statement on line 189 that the food waste
23 program is a concern for the Department of Public Health.

24
25 MSWMAC member Debbie Anspaugh stated that at line 215 “store” should be changed
26 to “story.”

27
28 Garber proposed MSWMAC member Rob Van Orsow’s e-mailed edits to the minutes
29 since he was not in attendance. Van Orsow requested that lines 172 and 173 be replaced
30 with the following sentences, “Van Orsow noted Waste Management now sends South
31 King County recyclables to nearby MRFs in South King County and Pierce County

32 instead of taking them to Woodinville. Also, a new MRF is coming on-line in
33 Fredrickson near Puyallup.”

34

35 *The June minutes were unanimously approved as amended.*

36

37 **GBB: Third Party Review Report: Presentation and Discussion**

38 King County Council staff Mike Reed introduced Harvey Gershman of Gershman,
39 Brickner & Bratton, Inc. (GBB). Reed stated that Council is excited about the conclusion
40 of this process, and that the comment period has been extended until the 21st of this
41 month. GBB’s draft report can be found at:

42 <http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrp/swd/GBBDraftReport070507.pdf>

43

44 Gershman’s presentation is at:

45 <http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrp/swd/GBBMSWMACPresentation071307.ppt>

46

47 Pelosa stated that a one page executive summary should be included in the report
48 covering important points and making it easier for cities to understand the report’s
49 conclusions. Pelosa commented that the tables were great for the committee members to
50 see.

51

52 MSWMAC member David Baker stated that he liked the suggestion of renaming the
53 transfer stations Materials Resource Centers.

54

55 MSWMAC Vice-Chair Jessica Greenway asked why there are so many self-haulers in
56 King County. Gershman answered that tradition is one reason. In areas where they have
57 mandatory service, self hauling is not allowed.

58

59 Greenway asked if having mandatory service reduces self-hauling. Interim Solid Waste
60 Division Director Kevin Kiernan said that while the City of Seattle has mandatory service
61 they still have a significant number of self haulers.

62

63 Gershman stated that curbside service must include bulky item pick-up and special
64 collections in order to reduce demand for self-haul service.

65

66 McGilton said that there were three interesting issues from the powerpoint that she
67 wanted to highlight:

- 68 1. building walls around the Cedar Hills landfill to increase capacity,
- 69 2. a partnership with the City of Seattle for an intermodal system, and
- 70 3. waste-to-energy feasibility.

71 McGilton said these ideas may sound good but doubted their feasibility.

72

73 Gershman replied that he did not say that conversion technology was feasible here, just
74 that it works. He said it is up to the governing bodies to decide if they want it or not.

75 Gershman stated that the technologies are much better now than they were in the 1980s.

76 He said that a conversion technology facility would be an asset just like Cedar Hills
77 landfill, and the county would not have to depend on someone else's infrastructure.

78

79 Gershman said that Babylon, New York has expanded its landfill capacity by building
80 walls. Gershman said he has provided the data on building walls around the landfill to
81 the division for analysis. Kiernan stated that the division has started to examine the data.

82

83 Gershman said that it should not be necessary to have a 1000 foot buffer next to a
84 superfund site and a compost facility, particularly when state regulations only require a
85 100 foot buffer for a non-residential property which is used to the south.

86

87 MSWMAC member Rika Cecil asked why Enumclaw was cited as a model transfer
88 station. Gershman replied that it has an extensive recycling area. Kiernan stated that the
89 Shoreline transfer station will be the model when it's completed.

90

91 MSWMAC member Sharon Hlavka asked if GBB had suggestions on early export and
92 what percentage of waste should be exported initially. Charles Banks of R.L. Banks &
93 Associates stated that the percentage of waste shouldn't be the consideration. He said that

94 payment isn't per train car, but per train and that building the longest train possible will
95 keep costs down.

96

97 Gershman said that waste from King County and the City of Seattle should be combined
98 to realize the greatest savings. He said that the jurisdictions should also consider a joint
99 intermodal facility.

100

101 Kiernan thanked GBB for their hard work on the report. He said that many of the
102 questions presented, such as reaching a 60 percent recycling rate and Cedar Hills landfill
103 capacity, will be addressed in the Comp Plan update.

104

105 **Conversion Technologies Study: Discussion**

106 Kiernan introduced consultant Karl Hufnagel of R.W. Beck.

107

108 Garber asked if suggestions made by MSWMAC members will be included in the report.

109 Kiernan said that the proviso provides for comments from the advisory committees. He
110 said that if the committee expressed a policy choice that would be an addendum to the
111 report. Technical corrections would be included in the final report.

112

113 Garber asked if MSWMAC will be able to see the final draft and approve it. Kiernan
114 said that the report is for informational purposes and does not contain recommendations.
115 MSWMAC can comment on the report, but there is no need to approve it.

116

117 The draft report can be found at:

118 <http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrp/swd/DraftCTReport060807.pdf>

119

120 Cecil said that Table 16-1 of Section 16-5 contradicts the values given in the table on
121 page ES-8. Hufnagel said he was not sure why there was a difference, but that R.W.
122 Beck will check the numbers.

123

124 Kiernan said there was a revision made to “Present Value” data, correcting a
125 miscalculation in the draft that was originally circulated. While this will impact the
126 numbers about \$3 per ton, the cost range for the three technologies stays the same.

127

128 The addendum with the corrected information is at the following link:

129 <http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrp/swd/062607AmendCTDraft.pdf>

130

131 Hufnagel discussed the comments from Bellevue staff Susan Fife-Ferris, which are at the
132 following link:

133 <http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrp/swd/MSWMACBellevueWTEcomments.pdf>

134

135 In response to question one, Hufnagel said that the study didn’t look at risk. Intermodal
136 is a low risk technology because it is already locally used and is a very straightforward
137 system. The same cannot be said for conversion technologies because of the complex
138 nature of the machinery. However, the technology is well proven if design and
139 construction is undertaken by a proven vendor. Garber said that each of the technologies
140 should have the same level of treatment.

141

142 Regarding question two, Hufnagel said that the cost analysis of ash hauling was based on
143 actual disposal costs borne by the Spokane facility Hufnagel stated that he did not think
144 Fife-Ferris’ numbers for the amount of backup disposal capacity that would be needed
145 are accurate. R.W. Beck consultant Jeff Clunie said that you can not simply sum up the
146 numbers for bypass, downtime, and ash to estimate the efficiency of the system. The
147 amount of bypass waste will depend on the size of the facility.

148

149 Leonhart stated that the numbers Fife-Ferris used were taken from the tables on pages 6-
150 12 and 6-13. Damon M. K. Taam from Power Waste Recovery answered that their
151 experience with the Spokane conversion facility shows a 90 percent volume reduction.
152 Residual disposal is priced per ton, which is not the same as garbage. This is critical in
153 the reduction in long haul. Spokane is also looking at options on recycling the ash.

154

155 Baker asked if Spokane had any experience with equipment failures. Taam replied that
156 all equipment has planned and unplanned outages. Taam stated that the contract
157 anticipates 80 percent availability and currently it's at 90 percent. Taam continued that
158 things are fairly easy to fix and it's a matter of good maintenance and management.

159

160 Garber asked about a technical glitch that the Spokane facility recently experienced
161 resulting in a pink cloud. Taam said that was not a technical issue, but a pharmaceutical
162 company had delivered iodine in their waste that produced the pink cloud. There was no
163 violation or failure. They try to send these types of products somewhere else.

164

165 Garber asked how the assumption can be made about the amount of long haul capacity if
166 the amount of waste is not known. Hufnagel replied that it is an assumption. Garber said
167 that the report should indicate that the numbers are an estimate.

168

169 In response to Fife-Ferris' third question regarding the capital cost estimates, Clunie
170 answered that R.W. Beck met with a leading vendor and developed a detailed cost
171 estimate. Garber said that without a bid the numbers will only be estimates.

172

173 In response to the fourth question, Clunie said that the numbers are conservative and well
174 within demonstrated abilities of a conversion technology facility. Energy revenue was
175 reasonable. Hufnagel said that price forecasting in the energy business is based on
176 scientific models that are well proven. Taam added that the Spokane facility's data is
177 reflective of this information.

178

179 Hufnagel replied to the fifth question saying that siting a conversion technology facility is
180 problematic and to go beyond the information that has already been provided would
181 require a specific location. Garber stated that she would agree with that and in Section 14
182 the report addresses the issue. Clunie suggested that additional information about siting
183 can be added to the Executive Summary.

184

185 Garber said that in the 1980's a siting study was in the \$2 million range. She asked
186 whether, when estimating the cost of siting a waste to energy facility, R.W. Beck

187 assumed a specific number of sites would be evaluated, and if it was assumed that King
188 County's detailed siting process would be used.

189

190 Hufnagel replied that the numbers are not based on evaluation of a single site but would
191 include multiple locations and no assumption was made about the process that would be
192 used. The lowest end of the possible cost range was used. Also, the siting process has
193 become more efficient and well known compared to twenty years ago as the public has
194 become well versed in the steps.

195

196 Garber said that she was glad to see an assumption that air and meteorologic data would
197 be available.

198

199 Taam added that community support is helpful. If private vendors sited the facility they
200 would determine the best site as opposed to a public sector process, where the best
201 location has to be proved.

202

203 Garber stated that Washington regulations subject private vendors to the same laws as a
204 public agency.

205

206 Kiernan said that question six is a policy issue that is for the cities and county to decide.

207

208 Leonhart commented about the information on the table on page 7-20 stating that paper
209 and plastic are valuable commodities. She said that value should be considered when
210 comparing recycling to energy generation.

211

212 Greenway said that this suggests a philosophical conflict that has to be resolved. The
213 same materials we want to recycle provide the best fuel source for waste to energy. If we
214 accomplish our recyclable goals, would a conversion technology facility still be
215 practical?

216

217 Hufnagel stated that R.W. Beck looked at two cases, one based on a 60 percent recycling
218 rate and one based on a 70 percent recycling rate. With the 60 percent recycling rate there

219 is no shortage of materials to burn. With a 70 percent recycling rate, energy generation is
220 reduced.

221

222 Taam stated that Spokane does not have a conflict between waste to energy and
223 recycling, and their recycling rate is in the mid 40 percent range. Cardboard, mixed
224 paper and newspaper are recycled. Waste to energy encourages recycling of glass and
225 metal, which do not burn. They aggressively recycle yard waste, which has low BTU
226 value. They are looking at a new backend process for recovering nonferrous metals.

227

228 Council staff Mike Huddleston asked what the tipping fee was in Spokane. Taam
229 answered that it is \$98/ton, \$165/ton for special waste. Huddleston asked if grant funds
230 were used to build the facility. Taam replied that bonds were used and they will be paid
231 off by 2011. The energy revenue equals the amount of operational costs. If the bonds
232 were paid off today there would be no tipping fee. In response to a question, Taam said
233 their contract is with Puget Power.

234

235 To question seven Hufnagel replied that he was not sure if such a study existed.

236

237 For question eight Hufnagel stated that incinerator ash was addressed in the report.
238 MSWMAC member Joyce Nichols stated that Fife-Ferris may have been asking for a
239 comparison of different states.

240

241 Hufnagel said that they were told to look specifically at Washington state regulations.
242 Garber said that page 9-2 goes into details about those regulations. Taam added that ash
243 disposal is less expensive than garbage disposal. Hufnagel said that there are no
244 permitted uses of residue ash within state regulations, except for Spokane's use of ash in
245 landfills, which was stated in the report.

246

247 Hufnagel said the reason that land cost was not included in the report is because land
248 prices vary greatly from place to place. Any statements about land costs would be
249 speculative. However the price of land is small in comparison to the overall cost of the

250 system. Garber said a statement on the speculative nature of any estimates of the cost of
251 land should be included.

252

253 In regards to question ten, Kiernan said that the County will address that point.

254

255 In response to question eleven Hufnagel said that Appendix B discusses the Spokane
256 facility. Hufnagel said he would try to obtain information on projected vs. actual capital
257 costs of the Spokane facility.

258

259 Baker asked if the transportation costs provided were in 2007 or 2016 dollars. He asked
260 how equipment costs could be projected on equipment not owned by the County. Tipton
261 replied that the waste export market drivers are very different, and fuel prices cannot be
262 predicted. R.W. Beck used current rates and escalated those rates based on inflation.

263

264 Kiernan stated that currently the rail contracts are long-term contracts. In the future it is
265 less likely that there will be long-term contracts. Hufnagel said it is difficult to forecast
266 whether mainline rail capacity will diminish. The risk lies not in the cost but in
267 availability. Clunie stated that a full cost sensitivity analysis of fuel can be added, and
268 that they have a model to do this. Garber said that she favored avoiding the issues that
269 are speculative in nature and a sensitivity analysis would be unnecessary.

270

271 Garber said that page one of section 13.1 points out that if one transfer station was
272 replaced by a conversion technology facility the conversion facility would need a
273 separate onsite drop-off area for self haulers. She suggested that information be repeated
274 in the conclusion.

275

276 Garber thanked R.W. Beck for attending today's meeting to answer questions and
277 complimented them on the report. Garber asked that R.W. Beck prepare a responsiveness
278 summary of the questions for MSWMAC.

279

280 Taam stated that anyone interested in touring the Spokane facility should contact him.

281

282 **Updates: SWD/SWAC/ITSG/Master Schedule:**

283 **SWD:**

284 Kiernan announced that the King County Council approved the division's rate proposal
285 on Monday July 9th. Kiernan thanked MSWMAC for their support.

286

287 Council approved the landfill gas contract on Tuesday, July 10th. The division is
288 optimistic that construction will begin in 2008.

289

290 Council has required an independent third party review of the division's cost analysis of
291 the proposal to bring hauling of recyclables from the transfer stations in-house.

292

293 Kiernan said that he wanted to update MSWMAC on the Port of Seattle and King County
294 talks regarding the proposed swap of the eastside Burlington Northern rail corridor for
295 Boeing Field.

- 296 • In October, Theresa Jennings notified MSWMAC of the discussions between the
297 Port of Seattle and King County regarding the proposed trade. She clarified that
298 while the discussions included the possibility that the Port would take ownership
299 of the division's Harbor Island property, the Port would either have to buy the
300 property or find a comparable property for an intermodal site for the division.
- 301 • The details of the proposal have changed and the Executive's office recently
302 briefed some city staff on the current proposal, which eliminates Boeing Field
303 from the transaction. No firm commitment has been made on the Harbor Island
304 property.
- 305 • The property was purchased as a potential intermodal site, but a siting process
306 has not yet been conducted for such a facility. Additionally, an intermodal
307 facility could be provided by the private sector.
- 308 • The division has always been committed to a thorough site selection process
309 prior to making the determination that this or any other property is appropriate
310 for an intermodal site. The Transfer and Waste Export System Plan contains a
311 siting process developed in consultation with the cities. The division will follow
312 this process when and if an intermodal site is needed.

313 Kiernan stated that these points represent the Executive's position. .

314

315

316 SWAC:

317 McGilton presented the SWAC update. SWAC was presented with the same presentation
318 that MSWMAC saw on Single and Multi Family Recycling Diversion Options.

319 McGilton said that the only difference included an in depth discussion on glass and the
320 problems that it causes in the system. Recycling and Environmental Services Manager
321 Jeff Gaisford stated that this issue is being addressed.

322

323 McGilton stated that two cities, including the City of Kirkland, have aggressive recycling
324 programs and are models for other cities.

325

326 ITSG:

327 Anspaugh gave the Interjurisdictional Technical Staff Group (ITSG) update. ITSG had
328 two meetings in June. At the first meeting, the comments from Shoreline and Bellevue
329 on the conversion technology report were discussed. At the second meeting, ITSG
330 reviewed a presentation on rural level of service.

331

332 Schedule:

333 Garber announced that there were no changes to the master schedule.

334

335 Nichols said that Armanini had contacted her about Allied Waste's new billing practice.

336 Nichols said that Allied Waste has changed the payment due date on their bills and she
337 wanted to bring this to the attention of the cities. Quarterly bills are distributed mid-
338 quarter, and payment used to be due at the end of the quarter. Now the bills are payable
339 in two weeks – six weeks before the end of the quarter. Although late fees are not
340 applied until the end of the quarter, the bill makes no statement to that effect. This gives
341 Allied the use of customers' money sooner, improves their cash flow, and essentially
342 requires customers to pay for services that they have not yet received. When Nichols
343 contacted Allied Waste they were forthcoming with the information that this new billing
344 practice was based on a desire to improve cash flow for the company. Nichols asked if
345 MSWMAC would be interested in sending a letter to Allied Waste in opposition to this

346 business practice. Nichols said that she told Allied Waste that the City of Bellevue would
347 send a letter to their ratepayers if the company did not.

348

349 MSWMAC member Frank Iriarte said that the City of Tukwila is having the same issue
350 with Allied. Tukwila has already drafted a letter to the company.

351

352 Baker said that his wife had also noticed this change in their bill last quarter.

353

354 MSWMAC member Linda Knight said that this is not a MSWMAC issue. She suggested
355 that cities include language in their contracts to address billing practices.

356

357 Garber agreed that a MSWMAC letter would not be appropriate.

358

359 Nichols said Bellevue would be happy to have other cities that contract with Allied sign
360 on to their letter.

361

362 **ITSG Legislation: Discussion**

363 Huddleston said that the issue of adding a work plan for MSWMAC to the legislation
364 making ITSG a permanent body is not on the RPC agenda for next week. The topic will
365 be discussed in MSWMAC before it is discussed at RPC. Huddleston acknowledged
366 that there were concerns about the reports that the work plan will require, and on the
367 extensive amount of work that was going to go into them. He said the good news is that
368 the process works and solid waste issues that were contentious before are now working
369 towards resolution. Reports will likely be required on the following issues:

- 370 • Cedar Hills landfill capacity
- 371 • Recycling
- 372 • Waste-to-Energy conversion technologies
- 373 • Intermodal and long haul
- 374 • Construction schedule, and
- 375 • Governance

376 The work program can be appended to either of two pieces of legislation; the legislation
377 to make ITSG permanent, or the legislation approving the Transfer and Waste Export
378 System Plan.

379

380 Huddleston said Council is grateful to ITSG and MSWMAC for all their hard work. As
381 the recent approval of the rate proposal has shown, they like the process and everyone
382 better understands the choices and the trade-offs involved in these decisions.

383

384 Garber said that there is concern that this more formal process is going to be counter
385 productive since it will delay the established schedule for the Comp Plan update. Garber
386 stated that she would hope to avoid that inefficiency.

387

388 Huddleston replied that the last rate proposal was ten years ago, and that a lot of work
389 was put into that. This work was wasted because there was no community process.

390 Garber replied that there needs to be an understanding that it would take longer than
391 originally scheduled. Huddleston agreed that would be the trade-off.

392

393 Greenway said that she had a hard time understanding the process. Huddleston replied
394 that the process is not yet set, and could involve white papers that council would approve.
395 Huddleston stated that the benefit of the process is regional consensus.

396

397 Knight stated that that was the motivation for the formation of MSWMAC and it has
398 already resulted in community consensus. She said it seems like an extra layer is being
399 added with these reports.

400

401 Huddleston said that these “check-ins” to eliminate any disconnect between those making
402 recommendations. This will ensure that recommendations are going to be implemented.

403

404 Garber stated that the nature of the Comp plan is to provide alternatives. Council can not
405 limit those choices without environmental review. Garber said that there must be an
406 understanding that it’s less efficient and the process will take longer with additional

407 reports. She said that naturally Council should be briefed as the Comp Plan process goes
408 forward, and she doesn't see what is accomplished with an incremental approval process.

409

410 Huddleston replied that there are issues where people have not made their positions clear,
411 such as conversion technologies. His concern is that without input on those topics, a
412 Comp Plan will be produced that is not ratified. Garber asked if the purpose of the
413 reports then is to discover if the Comp Plan is developing in the right directions.

414

415 Hlavka stated that MSWMAC is an advisory group and that they are a medium to
416 communicate to Council.

417

418 Greenway asked if these reports would be approved by the city councils as well as the
419 county council. Huddleston stated MSWMAC does a good job and council knows that
420 cities are involved through MSWMAC, so a separate city council approval process would
421 not be necessary. He said that with this work plan, council is committing to take up these
422 issues as they come through.

423

424 Garber suggested that a formal paper for each report was unnecessary. Huddleston
425 agreed, saying that anything that looks like a decision paper would require a SEPA
426 process, so these reports have to be broad, like a white paper. They can illuminate
427 choices but not make decisions. Garber thanked Huddleston for coming and discussing
428 this with the group.

429

430 **Adjourn**

431 Garber announced that there was not enough time for the Rural Level of Service
432 presentation. It will be added to the September MSWMAC agenda.

433

434 The meeting adjourned at 2:40 p.m.

435

436 Submitted by:

437 Jennifer Broadus, SWD Staff